DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 403 495 CE 073 514

TITLE HRD Academic Programs.
PUB DATE 96
NOTE 26p.; In: Academy of Human Resource Development (AHRD) Conference Proceedings (Minneapolis, MN, February 29-March 3, 1996); see CE 073 480.
PUB TYPE Speeches/Conference Papers (150) -- Reports - Research/Technical (143)

EDRS PRICE MF01/PC02 Plus Postage.
DESCRIPTORS *Adult Education; Adult Educators; Cooperative Planning; *Curriculum Development; Economic Factors; Educational Attitudes; Educational Cooperation; Educational Research; Higher Education; *Integrated Curriculum; *Labor Force Development; National Surveys; Organizational Climate; Performance Technology; *Professional Development; Student Attitudes; Teacher Attitudes; Teacher Competencies; Teacher Education; Teacher Improvement; Training; Training Methods
IDENTIFIERS Facilitators

ABSTRACT

This document contains three papers presented at a symposium on human resource development (HRD) academic programs moderated by Gene Audette at the 1996 conference of the Academy of Human Resource Development. "Revisiting Perceptions of HRD Roles: Implications for HRD Curricula" (Danilo M. Baylen, Margaret L. Bailey, Mary Samardzija) discusses a study in which human resources development (HRD) practitioners and students enrolled in HRD or related programs identified needs analyst and group facilitator as the top HRD practitioner roles and strategic planner and performance technologist as emerging HRD practitioner roles. "Establishing a Research Base for Professional Development" (Robert E. Norton, Reva Hutchins) presents findings from a national study of teacher training needs and tasks for career-related teachers that will be used to establish a research base for professional development of teachers. "Profile of the Human Resource Development and Adult Education Professoriate and Perceived Dynamics Framing Program Integration" (Shari L. Peterson, Joanne Provo) reports a study that profiles the HRD and adult education professoriate, describes economic and organizational dynamics that may help shape the direction of both HRD and adult education, and identifies the nature of organizational alliances that may serve to integrate the two fields. Papers contain references. (MN)

****
* Reproductions supplied by EDRS are the best that can be made *
* from the original document. *
****

ED 403 495

SYMPOSIUM
[33] HRD ACADEMIC PROGRAMS

Chair: Gene Audette, University of St. Thomas

Revisiting Perceptions of HRD Roles: Implications for HRD Curricula
Danilo M. Baylen, Northern Illinois University
Margaret L. Bailey, Northern Illinois University
Mary Samardzija, Northern Illinois University

Establishing a Research Base for Professional Development
Robert E. Norton, Ohio State University
Reva Hutchins, Ohio State University

Profile of the Human Resource Development and Adult Education Professoriate and Perceived Dynamics Framing Program Integration
Shari L. Peterson, University of Minnesota
Joanne Provo, University of Minnesota

Academy of Human Resource Development
1996 Conference
Minneapolis, MN
February 29-March 3, 1996

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF EDUCATION
Office of Educational Research and Improvement
EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

☐ This document has been reproduced as received from the person or organization originating it.

☐ Minor changes have been made to improve reproduction quality.

• Points of view or opinions stated in this document do not necessarily represent official OERI position or policy.

PERMISSION TO REPRODUCE AND DISSEMINATE THIS MATERIAL HAS BEEN GRANTED BY

D. Baylen, R. Hutchins
S. Peterson

TO THE EDUCATIONAL RESOURCES INFORMATION CENTER (ERIC)

CE 073 514

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Revisiting Perceptions of HRD Roles: Implications for HRD Curricula

Danilo M. Baylen
Margaret L. Bailey
Mary Samardzija
Northern Illinois University

HRD practitioners and students enrolled in HRD or HRD-related programs were asked to rate thirteen HRD roles, selected from McLagan study (1989), regarding their importance to HRD practice and to identify new or emerging roles not included in McLagan's original list. The study revealed top roles to include Needs Analyst and Group Facilitator, and emerging roles to include among others Strategic Planner and Performance Technologist. A selected group of HRD or HRD-related course syllabi were reviewed in regard to coverage of the top roles identified.

In the last decade, different professional and academic groups have debated the need for common core roles that need to be addressed in college and university-based Human Resource Development (HRD) programs. The publication of the 1989 McLagan study, *Models for HRD Practice*, which became the standard of expected roles and competencies in the profession, subdued the ongoing debate. However, Willis & Kahnweiler (1995) argue that, "curriculum assumptions made on the basis of a taxonomy of what HRD practitioners currently do, cast primarily on the framework of 'deliverables,' would not adequately serve as the interest of a new and emergent profession" (p. 7-1). They postulate that the challenge to an HRD program is not only it's skill-based nature, but the consideration of "more reflective, theoretical, and integrated approaches to professional preparation" (p. 7-1).

Background

A review of the literature shows that the forces impacting business as a whole to change are also causing HRD as a function to follow suit. Chalofsky (1989) argues that the current research on the state of the practice and field of study is creating a major paradigm shift in how we envision HRD. However, he comments that "the state of the profession is still looking for a unifying base to rally around" (p. 176). Others who have joined the effort in defining the direction of the field argue from different perspectives: a shift from the behavior model to a transformative conception of learning (Watkins & Marsick, 1992); a rigorous definition and categorization of what the field is and is not (Nadler, 1992); or the use of competencies to facilitate the identification of HRD roles (McLagan, 1989).

Sussman & Kuzmits (1986) identify HRD roles as moving towards becoming more entrepreneurial. The traditional or administrative roles that portrayed HRD practitioners as reactive and subservient in problem-solving and made their interventions narrow and specific in closing performance gaps, have been replaced by entrepreneurial roles that are proactive, interdependent, and service-driven, and that can provide broad-based solutions. Walker (1989) identifies this change as starting in the 1960s and 1970s when HRD had been expected to specialize in the development of new practices and programs. In the 1980s, HRD shifted its emphasis on employee advocacy to teamwork and team building. Management expectations are playing a big part in reshaping the HRD roles of the 1990s. As partners with

© *copyright, D. M. Baylen, M. L. Bailey & M. Samardzija, 1996*

management, HRD practitioners have been asked to be directly involved in work force reductions, organizational mergers and acquisitions, productivity and total quality management efforts which are not necessarily function-specific activities. The changes in role expectations have pushed the human resource function to not only widen its scope, but to embrace key business concerns. As HRD practitioners begin to serve multiple constituencies, amidst rapidly changing environments, new roles are emerging that complement those already delineated.

Problem Statement

Upon reflection on the various points raised by the literature, as well as conversations with practitioners and students on the scope of their HRD programs, the researchers suspect that there is an existing discrepancy in what is being taught in the classroom and what is expected in practice of the graduates of HRD programs. Further, not all of the roles of McLagan (1989) are being fully addressed by HRD academic programs (Willis & Kahnweiler, 1995). Given the reality of what the academic programs address, the question becomes, "What are the critical areas of HRD practice that need to be communicated and taught to those who are entering the field?" Using the thirteen roles (refer to Table 1) as a starting point, this study looks at the current perceptions of what are critical for would-be practitioners from two perspectives, HRD students and practitioners.

Table 1. Selected HRD Roles Used in the Study (McLagan, 1989)

1. Evaluator	6. Program Designer	11. Marketer
2. Group Facilitator	7. Media Specialist	12. Task Analyst
3. Instructor	8. Needs Analyst	13. Theoretician
4. Instructional Writer	9. Program Administrator	
5. Development Counselor	10. Manager, Trng. & Devt.	

Research Questions

This study addresses four main questions:

1) What roles are identified by practitioners as critical in the current practice of HRD?
2) What roles are identified by students (of adult education, HRD, and instructional technology) as critical in the field of HRD? Do perceptions of practitioners and students differ?
3) What do practitioners and students (of adult education, HRD, and instructional technology) identify as critically emerging roles in HRD?
4) Are HRD curricula consistent with perceptions of criticality?

Methodology

Data was collected from two main sources: a survey questionnaire asking for perceptions of HRD roles that are important to HRD practice from HRD students and practitioners; and a compilation of HRD course syllabi (Gardner & Korth, 1995) which was used to identify HRD roles addressed by selected beginning and advanced level courses.

Survey. The survey was administered to graduate students of adult education, HRD, and instructional technology programs, enrolled in an HRD or HRD-related course in Fall, 1995 from four universities in Georgia, Illinois, New Mexico, and Ohio. Also, a group of HRD practitioners, who are based within the Chicago area and its suburbs, were surveyed. The survey effort generated seventy-five complete and valid questionnaires for data analysis.

To check for differentiation of perception across the surveyed population, the data was categorized into three groups of respondents: practitioners, student practitioners, and student non- practitioners. Practitioners are defined as individuals who perform one or more of the identified HRD roles on a full-time basis. Student practitioners are practitioners who are enrolled in an HRD program or HRD-related course as part of their professional development. Finally, student non-practitioners are graduate students enrolled in HRD or HRD-related programs but not working in HRD contexts. Most student non-practitioners are taking the HRD course as an elective to their graduate degree programs or as an initial move for a career change.

Course Syllabi. Finally, from compilation of HRD-related course syllabi (Gardner & Korth, 1995), nineteen beginning and sixteen advanced level courses were reviewed to identify the HRD roles that they addressed. In the collection of the syllabi, the editors attached a cover page that asked respondents to identify which of the HRD roles are being addressed by their syllabi. The syllabi included in the compilation were used during the academic year 1993-1994. This same set of syllabi was used to verify if the courses were addressing the emerging roles that survey respondents recommended.

Results

HRD practitioners, student practitioners and student non-practitioners were asked to rate each role on a scale from 1 - 4 (with 4=highest) on its importance to HRD practice. Means and standard deviations for each role were computed, and the means were ranked from Most Important (1) to Least Important (13). Table 2 provides the means, standard deviations, and rankings of the thirteen roles for each group.

Perceived Importance of HRD Roles to HRD Practice. With the exception of Media Specialist and Theoretician, all roles were perceived as important (scoring 3.0 or better) by all groups. HRD practitioners rated the three most important roles to be: Group Facilitator, Needs Analyst and Instructor. Student practitioners rated the three most important roles as Needs Analyst, Group Facilitator, and a tie between Manager of Training and Development and Program Designer. Student non-practitioners rated Needs Analyst, Group Facilitator, and Program Designer as the top three roles.

Across audiences, there is agreement that the roles of Group Facilitator and Needs Analyst are among the most important roles in HRD practice. There is also agreement that, while not in the top three, the roles of Evaluator and Manager of Training and Development are important to HRD practice, with all three groups rating them within the top five.

By contrast, there appears to be a difference in perception of the importance of the roles of Instructor, Program Designer, and Program Administrator. Instructor was rated very highly by practitioners (2nd in ranking) while student practitioners and student non-practitioners rated it much lower (7th and 5th in rankings respectively). Program Designer was rated lower by practitioners (placing it 6th in ranking) while student practitioners and student non-practitioners rated it much higher (placing it 3rd for both groups). Finally, student non-practitioners felt Program Administrator was an important role, rating it much higher (placing it 5th) while both practitioners and student practitioners rated it much lower (placing it 10th for both groups).

There were also some consistencies across groups regarding which roles were perceived as less critical to the practice of HRD. All audiences perceived Media Specialist and Theoretician as one of the least important roles.

Table 2. Comparison of Perceptions on HRD Roles that are Important to HRD Practice

	Practitioners N=17			*Student Practitioners N=24*			*Student-Non Practitioners N=34*		
HRD Role	*R*	*M*	*SD*	*R*	*M*	*SD*	*R*	*M*	*SD*
Group Facilitator	1	3.71	0.456	2	3.58	0.493	2	3.68	0.468
Needs Analyst	2	3.59	0.599	1	3.79	0.406	1	3.81	0.405
Instructor	2	3.59	0.599	7	3.21	0.815	5	3.47	0.784
Evaluator	4	3.53	0.606	5	3.46	0.706	4	3.59	0.599
Manager, Trng. & Devt.	5	3.47	0.696	3	3.50	0.791	5	3.47	0.776
Program Designer	6	3.41	0.641	3	3.50	0.500	3	3.61	0.543
Instructional Writer	7	3.35	0.762	9	3.17	0.687	8	3.44	0.735
Development Counselor	8	3.24	0.729	6	3.29	0.676	9	3.38	0.728
Marketer	8	3.24	0.546	11	3.08	0.909	12	2.97	0.891
Program Administrator	10	3.18	0.706	10	3.13	0.781	5	3.47	0.652
Task Analyst	10	3.18	0.706	7	3.21	0.763	10	3.35	0.681
Media Specialist	12	2.88	0.832	11	3.08	0.909	11	3.10	0.729
Theoretician	13	2.65	0.026	13	2.88	0.086	12	2.97	0.857

Ratings ranged from 1 = Low Importance to 4 = High Importance.
R = Rank; M = Mean; and SD = Standard Deviation.

However, there were more differences than similarities when one looked at perceptions of less critical roles. For example, while student practitioners and student non-practitioners felt the role of Marketer was among the lowest (placing it 11th and 12th respectively), practitioners rated the role of Marketer as somewhat higher in importance (8th). Finally, student practitioners disagreed with practitioners and student non-practitioners on the importance of Task Analyst, rating it high (7th) while the two other groups rated it among the lowest (10th).

As a second source of data to validate rating scores, we asked respondents to list out the three roles they felt were most critical to the practice of HRD. Table 3 provides the frequency count for each role listed as a top three role. These are consistent with the survey data in regards to the six identified as the most important roles and the six least important. Note, however, that Program Designer (which was selected second most often) was listed more frequently than would have been expected based on the ranking of means in Table 2.

Table 3. HRD Roles Selected as One of the Three Most Important to HRD Practice

	Frequency Count		
HRD Role	*Practitioner N=17*	*Student Practitioner N=24*	*Student Non-Practitioner N=34*
Needs Analyst	9	11	15
Program Designer	8	9	12
Evaluator	5	5	18
Group Facilitator	8	7	8
Instructor	5	4	11
Manager, Trng. & Devt.	4	6	9
Development Counselor	2	3	6
Program Administrator	1	3	5
Task Analyst	2	5	2
Instructional Writer	2	2	3
Marketer	1	4	3
Theoretician	---	3	1
Media Specialist	---	---	2

Emerging Roles that are Important to HRD Practice. We provided all three groups with the opportunity to identify additional roles beyond the selected thirteen HRD roles which they felt are (or will be) critical to the practice of HRD. Table 4 provides the frequency of new or emerging roles identified by each group.

Table 4. Emerging Roles that Survey Respondents Identified as Important to HRD Practice

	Frequency Count		
Emerging HRD Role	*Practitioners N=17*	*Student Practitioners N=24*	*Student Non-Practitioners N=34*
Strategic Planner	3	2	---
Organization Developer	1	1	1
Benefits/Compensation Coordinator	2	---	1
Budget/Cost Analyst	1	---	2
Performance Technologist	1	2	---
Manager of Change	1	1	---
Quality Program Manager	1	1	---
Organizational Communications Spec.	1	1	---
Recruiter	2	---	---
Team Builder	---	1	---
Negotiator	---	1	---
Leader	---	---	1

It was not surprising that student non-practitioners were unable to identify more than a handful of emerging roles for HRD given their limited exposure to day-to-day business trends. Practitioners had no difficulty identifying new and emerging roles. Among the top roles were Strategic Planner, Organization Developer, Benefits and Compensation Coordinator, Budget and Cost Analyst, Manager of Change, and Performance Technologist. It is likely that the role of Benefits and Compensation Coordinator came out in the survey because it is a time-consuming and on-going role which is not apparently covered in any of the thirteen other roles. The other five roles, however, appear to be based on emerging trends in HRD practice and in the business world in general.

HRD Academic Program Consistency with Perceptions of the Criticality of HRD roles. Thirty-five syllabi from HRD or HRD-related graduate-level courses (Gardner & Korth, 1995) were compared to HRD roles to determine if courses were covering the roles identified as most important to HRD practice as based on survey results (see Tables 2 and 3). Table 5 provides the number of course syllabi which address each of the original thirteen roles. Table 6 provides the number of course syllabi which address the top six emerging roles identified in the survey (see Table 4).

Table 5. Number of Selected HRD Course Syllabi that Address Critical HRD Roles

HRD Roles	*Beginning Course N=19*	*Advanced Course N=16*	*Total N=35*
Instructor ***	11	5	16
Program Designer	12	3	15
Manager, Trng. &Devt./HRD **	6	8	14
Needs Analyst	7	2	9
Organizational Change Agent **	7	2	9
Evaluator	5	2	7
Program Administrator	4	2	6
Materials Developer **	5	1	6
Development/Career Counselor **	3	2	5
Marketer	2	1	3
Theoretician/Researcher **	2	—	2
Group Facilitator ***	•	•	•
Media Specialist	•	•	•
Task Analyst	•	•	•
Instructional Writer	•	•	•

* *HRD roles that are reflected in McLagan (1989) but not in Gardner & Korth (1995).*
** *Other HRD roles that Gardner & Korth (1995) used.*
*** *Gardner & Korth (1995) combined Instructor/Facilitator for their survey.*

It appears that four of the top six roles (identified in italics in Table 5) are addressed often in HRD courses. Instructor and Group Facilitator roles (these were combined in the Gardner & Korth, 1995 data) are addressed in 16 of the 35 syllabi. Program Designer is addressed in 15 of the 35 course syllabi. Manager of Training and Development is addressed in 14 of the 35 syllabi, with the majority of coverage (8) in advanced level courses.

The remaining of the top six roles of Evaluator and Needs Analyst, while covered in several course syllabi, do not appear to be addressed consistently with their importance ratings. Evaluator is addressed in 7 of the 35 course syllabi. Needs Analyst (which was rated

as most or second most important by all groups) was addressed in 9 of the 35 courses, 7 of these being beginning level courses.

The emerging role of Organizational Developer was addressed often in HRD course syllabi (12 of the 35). The remaining top six emerging roles (Performance Technologist, Manager of Change, Strategic Planner, Budget/Cost Analyst, and Benefits/Compensation Coordinator) were not addressed frequently in HRD or HRD-related courses. The role of Benefits/Compensation Coordinator was not addressed in any of the HRD course syliabi reviewed.

Table 6. Number of Selected HRD Syllabi that Address Emerging HRD Roles

Emerging HRD Roles	*Beginning Course N=19*	*Advanced Course N=16*	*Total N=35*
Organizational Developer	9	3	12
Performance Technologist	1	5	6
Manager of Change	2	2	4
Strategic Planner	1	1	2
Budget/Cost Analyst	2	---	2
Benefits/Compensation Coordinator	---	---	---

Discussion on the Implications for HRD Curricula

This study provides academic programs information to consider in the evaluation and development of their current HRD courses and curricula. It is meant to provide one source of data which allows academic programs to assess their consistency with current perceptions and emerging trends in the practice of HRD.

First, the study helps to validate that most of the roles identified in McLagan (1989) remain important to the practice of HRD. With the exception of Media Specialist and Theoretician, all roles rated above 3.0 (with 4.0=Most Important). Part of the lack of enthusiasm over Media Specialist may be in the semantics involving the term "media," which is now in instructional technology circles most often replaced with the term "technology." This suggests that Technology Specialist would likely rate higher than Media Specialist. Another explanation may be that HRD in practice no longer embraces the importance of a single area of expertise or specialty. This is reflected in the fact that the roles rated highest were broad based and related to leading and participating in organizational problem-solving (Needs Analyst, Group Facilitator and Evaluator). The lower rating for Theoretician is distressing. Academicians and researchers do not hesitate to see value in theory and research. Perceptions of practitioners and students, however, may be influenced by their perceptions of limited direct relevancy between HRD theories and their application to solving specific organizational problems.

Second, this study provides a source of comparison for assessing the strategic direction of academic programs in HRD. Based on the perceptions of practitioners and students regarding the most important roles in current practice, this study suggests programs consider reviewing curricula in regards to where and in what depth the six top roles of Needs Analyst, Group Facilitator, Instructor, Manager of Training and Development, Evaluator and Program Designer are addressed.

Further, this study provides insights into the emerging HRD roles which are important for academic programs to assess frequently and integrate into curricula in order to maintain marketable graduates. In particular, this study suggests that academic programs consider reviewing curricula in regards to how and where roles related to Strategic Planning, Change

Management, Budget/Cost Analysis, Benefits/Compensation, and Performance Technology are being addressed.

As the HRD field continues to evolve and expand, and additional roles continue to be identified in practice, it may be important for academic programs to create program visions or identities which provide in-depth coverage for critical roles as determined by local customers. It is a growing challenge for academic programs, graduate programs in particular, to continue to "cram" additional content into a limited number of credit hours. This study may provide one source of data for assessing priorities in current curricula, and for assessing programs for areas of new emphasis (e.g., in organizational development or performance technology) to meet local customer expectations.

Finally, this study supports the benefits of a strategic approach to the development and assessment of curricula. Like our public sector counterparts, academic institutions *can* develop high quality academic programs based on strong visions and strategic plans, and validate them through solid measures of customer (student and practitioner) expectations and satisfaction.

Directions for Further Research

This study reflects one step toward a more integrative and strategic approach to designing and developing HRD curricula. Several questions remain to be answered. If the emerging roles identified in this study are important to HRD practice, what specific skills or competencies define successful performance of each role? Are there additional skills or competencies that are integrative and address multiple roles that must also be addressed in academic curricula (e.g., negotiation, learning to learn, etc.)? How can these be identified and validated? What other sources of perception (customers) are important in developing a strategic HRD curriculum?

Next steps for this research team will be to continue the research toward the validation and identification of skills and competencies, validating those identified by McLagan (1989) and analyzing further emerging roles in HRD practice.

References

Chalofsky, N. (1992). A unifying definition for the human resource development profession. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 3*(2), 175-182.

Gardner, B. S., and Korth, S. J. (Eds.). (1995). *Human resource development syllabi.* Cincinnati, OH: Xavier University.

McLagan, P. A. (1989, September). Models for HRD practice. *Training & Development Journal, 43*, 49-59.

Marsick, V. J. (1990). Altering the paradigm for theory building and research in human resource development. *Human Resource Development Quarterly, 1*(1), 5-24.

Nadler, L. (1992). HRD — Where has it been, where it is going? *Studies in Continuing Education, 1*(14), 104-114.

Sussman, L. & Kuzmits, F. (1986, August). The HRD professional as entrepreneur. *Training & Development Journal*, 42-44.

Walker, J. (1989). Human resource roles for the '90s. *Human Resource Planning, 12*(1), 55-61.

Willis, V. J., and Kahnweiler, W. M. (1995). Genesis and continuance of an HRD academic program: A longitudinal study. In E. Holton (Ed.), *Proceedings of the 1995 Academy of Human Resource Development Conference* (p. 7-1). St. Louis, MO: AHRD.

Watkins, K. & Marsick, V. (1992). Building the learning organization: A new role for human resource developers. *Studies in Continuing Education, 14*(2), 115-129.

Establishing a Research Base for Professional Development

Robert E. Norton
Reva Hutchins
The Ohio State University

As technology advances in the workplace and preparatory teaching/learning strategies change to meet the resulting challenges, actions need to be taken to assess teacher training needs, plan teacher training programs and identify existing materials or develop new competency-based materials designed specifically to meet the training needs of career related teachers. Career related teachers are defined for purposes of this study as secondary level vocational teachers, postsecondary level vocational-technical instructors, academic teachers working in an occupational setting, and business-industry trainers. This paper presents important findings from a national study which included assessing teacher training needs and verifying tasks for career related teachers. Findings will be used to establish a research base for the professional development of teachers.

Problem Statement and Theoretical Framework

There is a need for high-quality and up-to-date instructional materials that address the competencies essential to excellent teaching. Competencies are defined as tasks performed by the career related teachers, therefore, for the purpose of this study, the terms 'tasks' and 'competencies' will be used interchangeably. According to Teacher Education Task Force findings (1995), many persons representing a whole range of teacher education institutions and professional associations throughout the United States have expressed concern regarding the ability to adequately address this need in the 21st century. If we are to have well-prepared youth and adults who can enter the workforce prepared for success, we must first have well-prepared teachers and instructors. The preparation of knowledgeable and skilled teachers requires the availability of high-quality instructional materials which address the classic core competencies as well as the new concept priority areas. To address these needs, actions were initiated to conduct a national needs assessment, an occupational analysis, a national task verification, a detailed task analysis, and the systematic development of teaching materials (learning packages) which address the core competencies needed by secondary and postsecondary teachers and instructors.

Once the teaching materials have been developed, the materials will be duplicated and submitted to state representatives and teacher educators for critical review. The materials will include three learning experiences, at a minimum, which will be sequenced as theory, practice, and application in the teaching role. They will be produced in a high quality format approved by the sponsoring states, Illinois, Ohio, and Pennsylvania. Once the research phase has been completed and prototype materials are available, other states will be recruited as additional sponsors. The findings from the national task verification will be examined in this paper.

Purpose of Research Project

The national task verification segment of this project is part of a larger project whose purpose is: (1) to examine the current context of professional development for teachers serving secondary and postsecondary students; (2) to examine the current teacher education curriculum in terms of the extent

© *copyright, Norton & Hutchins, 1996*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

to which it is adequately preparing academic and vocational-technical teachers for their integrative instructional roles; and (3) to develop a series of exemplary instructional materials to meet the needs of preservice and inservice teacher preparation and staff development programs. The purpose of the national task verification segment, the focus of this paper, is to provide input for the preparation of modules or other instructional materials intended to meet preservice/inservice teacher preparation and staff development needs.

Objectives

The task verification survey was conducted to identify and verify classic and essential core competencies perceived to be needed by secondary and postsecondary teachers. The verified competencies will be used in the follow-on development of instructional materials intended to address new, high priority concepts such as vocational-academic integration, work-site learning, and authentic assessment as defined by the sponsoring states.

Research Questions

This study seeks to answer the following research questions:

1. What is the perceived relative importance of each aggregate set of tasks identified by the DACUM occupational analysis?
2. What is the perceived level of learning difficulty for each aggregate set of tasks?
3. What is the perceived relative level of overall criticality for each aggregate set of tasks?
4. What is the difference in perceived criticality of the aggregate sets of tasks among the four categories of teachers?

Methodology

A DACUM occupational analysis workshop was conducted to look specifically at the duties and tasks important to career related teachers. Following the identification of 13 duties encompassing 162 tasks, a national task verification survey was conducted. Three-hundred-thirty-three survey instruments were mailed to representatives from four target categories of educators in forty-one participating states. Of the 333 survey instruments mailed , 217 were completed and returned for a return rate of 65%. The four categories and their respective survey responses included: (A) Secondary Vocational Teachers and Postsecondary Vocational Instructors, n = 56, (B) Academic Teachers in an Occupational Setting, n = 22, (C) Business/Industry Trainer, n = 21, and (D) Administrators and Teacher Educators, n = 118. The 162 tasks associated with career related teachers were verified during the process. Comparison of criteria used in McLagan's Models for Excellence (1983) and the tasks was made. Task importance, task learning difficulty and the criticality of each task within the 13 duties were determined as part of the task verification. Respondents were asked to rate the importance of each task and the task learning difficulty on a 6-point Likert-type scale from 0 to 5, with zero being the least important/least difficult and five being the greatest importance/most difficult. Means and standard deviations are on duty averages. The competencies to be addressed through the teaching materials will be determined by state representatives, using the results of the occupational analysis, and the national task verification process. Duty variables were computed by averaging the task ratings for each duty. Task criticality was calculated by multiplying the rated task importance times the rated task learning difficulty. Duties include:

Duty A Develop Relationships with Business and Industry
Duty B Develop Program/Course Curriculum
Duty C Promote the Education/Training Program
Duty D Prepare for Instruction
Duty E Facilitate Instruction
Duty F Manage the Classroom/Laboratory

Duty G Assess Student Performance
Duty H Advise Students
Duty I Manage Tools, Equipment, Supplies, & Materials
Duty J Support Student Organizations and Activities
Duty K Maintain Course Effectiveness
Duty L Perform teaching-Related Activities
Duty M Continue Professional Development

Findings

Table 1 reflects the relative importance of each of the 13 duties (aggregate tasks) included in the survey and Table 2 reflects the relative difficulty to learn the aggregate tasks associated with their respective duties. The tasks included in Duty K, Maintain Course Effectiveness were perceived to be the most important of the 13 duties with a mean score of 4.61. The aggregate tasks in Table 1 are arrayed from most important to least important with the tasks relating to Duty L, Perform Teaching Related Activities, being perceived as least important of the 13 with a mean score of 3.45. The aggregate tasks in Table 2 are arrayed from those perceived to be the most difficult to perform to those perceived least difficult to perform. As reflected in Table 2, Duty K, Maintain Course Effectiveness, again had the highest mean score (3.57) of all 13 aggregate tasks. Therefore, it can be said that the tasks associated with maintaining course effectiveness were perceived to be the most difficult to perform while the tasks associated with Duty L, Perform Teaching-Related Activities, were perceived to be the easiest to perform with a mean score of 2.44.

Table 1 **Relative Aggregate Importance of Tasks (I)**

Rank	Duty Variable	DUTY	Mean	SD	n
1	**Duty K**	Maintain Course Effectiveness	4.61	.47	212
2	**Duty D**	Prepare for Instruction	4.38	.54	210
3	**Duty H**	Advise Students	4.35	.74	214
4	**Duty M**	Continue Professional Development	4.31	.57	213
5	**Duty B**	Develop Program/Course Curriculum	4.30	.51	194
6	**Duty E**	Facilitate Instruction	4.28	.52	192
7	**Duty G**	Assess Student Performance	4.27	.64	210
8	**Duty A**	Develop Relationships w/ Business & Industry	4.08	.66	203
9	**Duty I**	Manage Tools, Equip, Supplies, & Materials	3.95	.98	209
10	**Duty F**	Manage the Classroom/Laboratory	3.91	.66	200
11	**Duty J**	Support Student Organizations and Activities	3.86	.94	208
12	**Duty C**	Promote the Education/Training Program	3.84	.75	202
13	**Duty L**	Perform Teaching-Related Activities	3.45	.74	190

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2 **Relative Aggregate Degree of Task Learning Difficulty (d)**

Rank	Variable	DUTY	Mean	SD	n
1	Duty K	Maintain Course Effectiveness	3.57	.89	209
2	Duty G	Assess Student Performance	3.43	..82	197
3	Duty D	Prepare for Instruction	3.37	.75	204
4	Duty A	Develop Relationships w/ Business & Industry	3.33	.66	180
5	Duty B	Develop Program/Course Curriculum	3.29	..66	185
6	Duty H	Advise Students	3.12	.86	207
7	Duty E	Facilitate Instruction	3.11	.69	180
8	Duty C	Promote the Education/Training Program	2.92	.73	184
9	Duty M	Continue Professional Development	2.75	.85	199
10	Duty J	Support Student Organizations and Activities	2.67	.93	178
11	Duty F	Manage the Classroom/Laboratory	2.63	.70	196
12	Duty I	Manage Tools, Equipment, Supplies, & Materials	2.45	.94	202
13	Duty L	Perform Teaching-Related Activities	2.44	.74	167

Table 3 **Relative Criticality Rating of Tasks within Duties (i x d)**

Rank	Variable	DUTY	Mean	SD	n
1	Duty K	Maintain Course Effectiveness	16.48	4.59	208
2	Duty D	Prepare for Instruction	14.86	3.97	202
3	Duty G	Assess Student Performance	14.83	4.34	196
4	Duty B	Develop Program/Course Curriculum	14.28	3.35	180
5	Duty H	Advise Students	13.76	4.31	207
6	Duty A	Develop Relationships w/ Business & Industry	13.75	3.70	178
7	Duty E	Facilitate Instruction	13.39	3.46	176
8	Duty M	Continue Professional Development	11.94	4.02	199
9	Duty C	Promote the Education/Training Program	11.41	3.90	182
10	Duty J	Support Student Organizations and Activities	10.80	4.86	195
11	Duty F	Manage the Classroom/Laboratory	10.48	3.46	177
12	Duty I	Manage Tools, Equip, Supplies, & Materials	10.16	4.88	201
13	Duty L	Perform Teaching-Related Activities	8.69	3.55	162

Table 3 shows the relative criticality rating of tasks within duties. Although rankings 2 through 12 show a somewhat different ranking for duty variables in Table 3, Duty K is still the top ranked variable and Duty L remains the lowest ranked variable, so it can be inferred that Duty K is the most critical and should be given the most weight during the development of course materials. Conversely, Duty L is thought to be the least important set of tasks and should be given the least weight of the 13 sets of tasks (duties). The duties were equally weighted during the analyses. Since criticality was computed by multiplying task importance (I) times task learning difficulty (d), and some instruments were incomplete, incomplete instruments were dropped in computing the overall criticality.

Table 4 **Summary of Survey Results** (Overall Criticality)

	Categories of Respondents	Count	Mean	Std Dev	Std Error
Group A	Secondary Vocational Teachers and Postsecondary Technical Instructors	21	11.7653	3.0899	.6743
Group B	Academic Teachers in an occupational setting	10	12.2849	2.5898	.8190
Group C	Business/ Industry Trainers	7	11.0793	2.4189	.9143
Group D	Administrators and Teacher Educators	49	13.9734	2.8740	.4106

In the summary table, Table 4, the means among the groups seem to vary. Group D had the highest mean and Group C had the lowest mean. The means were analyzed by ANOVA shown in Table 5. Tests for homogeneity of variances indicate that the variances did not differ significantly between groups. Therefore, the adverse impact of unequal cell sizes is minimal. As indicated in the table, we can reject the null hypothesis that all means of the groups were the same. To further investigate the differences between the group means, a post-hoc Tukey analysis was accomplished. The results indicate that Group A and Group D differ significantly.

Table 5 **Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)**

Source	df	Sum of Squares	Mean Squares	F Ratio	F Prob
Between Groups	3	109.3611	36.4537	4.4306	.0061
Within Groups	83	682.8973	8.2277		
TOTAL	86	992.2584			

Results/Conclusions

The differences among group means found in this study implies that groups differ in their judgment of task criticality in this investigation. This fact should most likely be taken into consideration as teaching materials are developed.

After the newly developed teaching materials undergo field reviews the data received will be summarized and used as a basis for further refinements. Programs will be based on competencies identified through research. Expected project outcomes will include programs based on competencies identified through research, professional development for the high-performance learning place, new materials that are field reviewed and proven effective, materials that address the cognitive, psychomotor and affective domains, programs that integrate theory and practice that are effective, efficient and consistent with high-quality teacher preservice and in service preparation, and high quality teachers. Better prepared teachers and students are expected as a result of this professional development effort.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

References

Task force report on vocational/technical teacher education (January, 1995). Sponsored by the National Association of State Directors of Vocational/Technical Education Consortium and the University Council for Vocational Education.

McLagan, P. A. (1989). Models for hrd practice: The manager's guide. Alexandria, VA: American Society for Training and Development (ASTD).

Profile of the Human Resource Development and Adult Education Professoriate and Perceived Dynamics Framing Program Integration

Shari L. Peterson
Joanne Provo
University of Minnesota

This study presents a profile of the HRD and AdEd professoriate, describes the nature of the economic and organizational dynamics that may help to shape the direction of the two fields, and identifies the nature of organizational alliances that may serve to integrate these two fields. Preliminary results, observations, and factors to be considered in the successful integration between these two fields are discussed.

As higher education faces global competition, pressures to maintain economic viability, cutbacks in funding, and needs of "non-traditional" students, the fields of Adult Education and Human Resource Development are positioning to meet the challenge. In many institutions throughout the United States, AdEd and HRD faculty are integrating philosophically and organizationally. As integration occurs and academic alliances are formed, issues affecting career development of faculty are likely to emerge.

Colleges and universities have considerable control over institutional forces that affect faculty careers (Duderstadt, 1995; Elmore, 1995; Firestone & Pennell, 1993; Johnstone, 1994; Kalivoda, 1994) . According to Johnstone (1994), the size of faculty is being reduced, the size of classes is being increased, and institutions are operating under less state support. With pressure to educate students in less time, at less cost, and with better results, Johnstone (1994) claims the challenge is to do so while offering a rewarding career choice for faculty. Yet the rewards that traditionally have existed in an academic career may be threatened by program alliances that could alter the reward system.

Faculty vitality can be sustained through creating a climate supportive of values such as a commitment to teaching and respect toward students, and through initiating faculty development programs such as mentoring (Kalivoda, 1994). However, instilling values and developing programs may not be adequate to forge an effective alliance. Structural and organizational changes do not necessarily lead to changes in teaching, learning, or student performance; rather, changes in teaching and learning are mediated by such powerful factors as shared norms, knowledge, and skills of teachers (Elmore, 1995). This conclusion, while presented in the context of primary education, may be applicable to the professoriate and to higher education. The implication cited by Elmore is applicable as well: Reformers might focus on changing norms, knowledge, or skills, *before* changing the structure; i.e., one might identify what practices need to be in place in order for structures to work. Thus integration and the formation of departmental partnerships for the purpose of efficiency may be premature. Faculty issues regarding professional fulfillment and norms for performance may need to be addressed to determine the characteristics of the integrating faculty and their compatibility prior to initiating departmental mergers.

One alliance that appears to be increasingly common is the integration between the fields of Adult Education and Human Resource Development. Questions raised by such mergers are whether or not there are differences in the characteristics and professional fulfillment of the respective faculties and their perceptions regarding program integration. There have been a variety of national studies of faculty in higher education covering a wide range of fields (Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, and Riley, 1978; Ladd & Lipset, 1976), as well as those specifically reflecting the adult education professoriate (Willie, Copeland, & Williams, 1985; Willie & Stecklein, 1982), and those drawing on regional differences (Eckert & Williams, 1972; Stecklein & Eckert, 1958). Other studies have examined such aspects of faculty as career choice, vitality, and productivity (e.g., Baldwin, 1990; Kalivoda, 1994; Sundre, 1992), or program characteristics and the nature of

© *copyright, Peterson & Provo, 1996*

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

curriculum (Harrison, 1995). However, there have been no recent comparative demographic studies of the faculty who comprise the professoriate and none that address linking the fields of Adult Education and Human Resource Development.

A review of selected studies focusing on faculty demographics and satisfaction, identifies several national and local studies that provide some baseline data. Faced with academic retrenchment, inflation, unemployment, and shifts in student demands for programs, Ladd & Lipset (1976) surveyed 4,000 regular, full-time college and university faculty at 111 institutions regarding their career expectations, attainments, and aspirations, and their opinions on issues facing higher education, and on social and political questions facing the nation. Baldridge, Curtis, Ecker, and Riley (1978) surveyed more than 9000 college and university faculty members to address the issue of morale. Local studies, namely Eckert and Williams (1972) and Stecklein and Eckert (1958) had not been replicated until Willie & Stecklein (1982) randomly sampled full-time faculty in Minnesota's accredited non-theological colleges and universities. Results from 772 men and 277 women (66.8%) were compared to the earlier studies. Based on questions regarding the nature of Minnesota college teachers, the professional endeavors in which they spend their time, and career satisfaction, it was concluded that the professoriate had remained relatively unchanged except that their educational level had risen. Faculty in Minnesota continued to find their careers satisfying, and most would make the same career selection again.

For comparative purposes, the instrument used in the 1982 study was adapted and the study conducted on a national scale. Willie, Copeland, & Williams (1985) sampled active professors of adult education in American and Canadian colleges and universities who held membership in the Commission of Professors of Adult Education. Preliminary results obtained from 146 men and 31 women (82.3% response) indicated that middle-aged and older men continued to comprise the bulk of the faculty, and that the median age continued to increase. The researchers predicted that Adult Education programs would change very little over the next decade. After all the responses were in (N = 215), Willie & Williams (1986) reported that only 38 (17.5%) were women. There were no gender differences in the amount of time spent on various activities, interest in research and writing, productivity, or career satisfaction. However, the women were younger and of lower rank than their male counterparts. Based on that finding, the authors now predicted that as men retire, their jobs would be filled by women who may come with different interests and thus may introduce new directions for the field.

The current study evolved based on the need to identify the feasibility of the current practice suggesting a trend toward academic integration between the fields of Human Resource Development and Adult Education. Thus the objectives of this study were to: (a) Profile the Human Resource Development and Adult Education professoriate and determine similarities and differences between them, (b) describe the nature of the job and the factors that contribute to the professional fulfillment of the faculties, and (c) identify some economic and organizational factors that contribute to the integration between the fields of Human Resource Development and Adult Education.

Specifically, the research questions were as follows:

1. What characteristics profile the current Human Resource Development and Adult Education professoriate?
2. What factors contribute to satisfaction and professional fulfillment of the Human Resource Development and Adult Education professoriate?
3. Are there differences in characteristics and the level of professional fulfillment between Human Resource Development and Adult Education professors?
4. What contributing factors are shaping the formation of departmental alliances between Human Resource Development and Adult Education programs?
5. What relationships exist between organizational and economic factors and the professional fulfillment of the faculty in the fields of Human Resource Development and Adult Education ?

Methodology

To develop a profile of the Human Resource Development (HRD) and Adult Education (AdEd) professoriate, identify factors that contribute to their professional fulfillment, and identify the perceived dynamics framing program integration, a survey of faculty was conducted. Following is a description of the population and sample, instrumentation, and procedures used in the study.

18 BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Population and Sample. A review of the various associations to which AdEd and HRD faculty were likely to belong identified two predominant organizations. The most widely recognized professional association for HRD faculty is The Academy of Human Resource Development. The most widely recognized professional association for AdEd faculty is The Commission of Professors of Adult Education.

In October, 1995, surveys were sent to all faculty members of the Academy of Human Resource Development (N=156) and to all members of the Commission of Professors of Adult Education (N=254). The initial response and telephone follow-up efforts identified faculty for whom the questionnaire did not apply due to changes in professional status, reducing the sample to 127 faculty in HRD and 214 faculty in AdEd, for a total of 341.

Preliminary response rates after the initial mailing and personal phone calls have yielded a 32.3% response from HRD faculty (N=41) and a 44.9% response from AdEd faculty (N=96), for a total response rate of 40.2% (N=137) to date. Aggressive follow-up procedures continue to be in process. A second survey has been faxed to all members who had not previously responded and for whom fax numbers were available; surveys were re-mailed to all other members who had not previously responded and for whom a fax number was not available. This paper reports the preliminary results based on analysis from 137 faculty respondents. Complete and validated results, inclusive of data obtained through exhaustive follow-up efforts, will be reported in future publications.

Instrumentation. The survey, entitled *The Adult Education and Human Resource Development Professoriate*, was divided into six sections: Section I: Demographic Data, Section II: Education and Experience, Section III: Present Position, Section IV: Organization and Economic Influences, Section V: Influences on Curricular Design and Research (not addressed in this paper), and Section VI: Professional Fulfillment. Responses to questions in Section IV: Organization and Economic Influences were based on a five-point Likert Scale ranging from Strongly Disagree (1) to Strongly Agree (5). Responses to questions in Section VI: Professional Fulfillment were based on a five-point Likert Scale ranging from Very Dissatisfying (1) to Very Satisfying (5). An open-ended question was asked to identify whether or not programs were in the process of being realigned or had recently realigned with other programs within the institution and the nature of that realignment. Most of the demographic questions were categorical, and some were open-ended.

Procedure. To develop a demographic profile, simple descriptive statistics were used to identify frequency distributions and means where applicable. Data were analyzed separately for Adult Education (AdEd) and for Human Resource Development (HRD), as well as aggregately. To identify factors which contribute to the satisfaction and professional fulfillment of the HRD and AdEd professoriate, means and sum of frequencies indicating satisfaction or dissatisfaction were obtained. Differences in characteristics and the level of professional fulfillment between Human Resource Development and Adult Education professors, was analyzed using a series of one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) procedures. Means and sum of frequencies indicating agreement or disagreement were obtained. To identify the nature of program integration efforts, responses to an open-ended question were analyzed using a qualitative approach. If the respondent wrote comments, the comments were recorded and analyzed to interpret the nature of the alignment. In addition, means and sum of frequencies indicating agreement or disagreement relevant to organizational and economic influences on alignment were obtained. A correlation matrix was developed to identify relevant relationships that existed between professional fulfillment and organizational and economic factors influencing the fields of AdEd and HRD.

Results and Discussion

The research questions are addressed within the following categories: Profile of the Professoriate describes faculty demographics and the nature of the job, Professional Fulfillment describes sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, and Program Integration describes alliances between Human Resource Development and Adult Education, and the relationship of organizational and economic factors to satisfaction.

Profile of the Professoriate. Demographic data describing the Human Resource Development (HRD) and Adult Education (AdEd) professoriate are presented in Table 1. The 1985 prediction that AdEd teaching positions would be filled by women as men retire appears to have been accurate. In the Willie, Copeland, & Williams study (1985), 82% of the faculty of Adult Education were male which was consistent at that time with other studies-- the Ladd & Lipset study (1976) reported 79% male, and the Willie and Stecklein study (1982) reported 74% male. Preliminary results obtained in the current study show that men comprise 64% of the faculty. While the professoriate is still predominantly male, more women are gaining entry to the field. The two fields are nearly identical in their gender distribution.

The 1985 study also predicted that the median age (47.6 in 1985) would continue to rise. While age was reported categorically in the present study, it is safe to confirm that the prediction holds true, as only 16% of the professoriate is younger than 45, and nearly one-third are 55 or older. However, HRD faculty are younger than AdEd faculty, with 22% reporting their age as younger than 45 and only 29% reporting their age as 55 or older. This trend seems reflective of the emerging nature of the HRD field.

Rank appears to be reflective of age: In 1985, 22% of the faculty were assistant professors, 35% were associate professors, and 43% were full professors. In 1995, 21% of the faculty are assistant professors, 31% are associate professors, 38% are full professors, and 10% hold some other title, most commonly adjunct. HRD faculty respondents as a whole reported lower ranks, consistent with their younger age.

Salary appears to be reflective of both age and rank, with the highest salaries reported among the AdEd faculty. However, institutional base salary is not the only source of income. Institutional base salary represents 83% of the total income for AdEd faculty, 27% of whom hold 12-month appointments, while it represents only 75% of the total income for HRD faculty, only 18% of whom hold 12-month appointments. It appears that HRD faculty, more so than AdEd faculty, cultivate other sources of income, primarily consulting. Consulting activities represented 13% of HRD faculty income and only 7% of AdEd faculty income. In 1986, 35% of faculty held 12 month appointments, but the current study indicates that this academic appointment may be on the decline.

The final element in Table 1 summarizes time spent on professional activities. For the AdEd faculty, this allocation of time can be compared to the 1985 study. In 1985, teaching represented 40% of the faculty's time, advising 15%, research and writing 10%, counseling 10%, committee and administrative duties 10%, off-campus service 5%, and other activities 10%. The current study indicates for AdEd faculty a reduction in time spent teaching and service to the community and an increase in the time spent on research and writing, and administrative duties and committee work. The time spent advising is about the same. There may be differences in time spent on various professorial activities between the AdEd and HRD faculty; statistical tests to identify those differences will be conducted and included in the final analysis (forthcoming).

Interestingly, the activity to which faculty would prefer to devote less time was committee work, even though this activity comprised only 5.2% of HRD faculty time and 6.1% of AdEd faculty time. When queried on the activity to which they would prefer to devote more time the overwhelming response was scholarly writing and research and evaluation. These activities were chosen by 64% of the AdEd respondents and 67% of the HRD respondents. In 1985, 69% of AdEd faculty wanted to devote more time to research and writing and 23% to teaching; 56% wanted to devote less time to committee and administrative assignments and 12% wanted to devote less time to teaching.

Table 1
Demographic Profile of Respondents

		HRD % (N=41)	AdEd % (N=96)	Total % (N=137)
Gender				
	Male	63.4	64.6	64.2
	Female	36.6	35.4	35.8
Age				
	25-34	0	0	0
	35-44	22.0	13.5	16.1
	45-54	48.8	52.1	51.1
	55-64	24.4	29.2	27.7
	65 +	4.9	5.2	5.1
Rank		(N=41)	(N=95)	(N=136)
	Assistant Professor	31.7	16.8	21.3
	Associate Professor	19.5	35.8	30.9
	Full Professor	34.1	40.9	38.2
	Other	14.6	7.4	9.6

Institutional Base Salary

	HRD % (N=39)	AdEd % (N=95)	Total % (N=134)
Under $25.0	0	1.1	.7
$25-34.9	10.3	4.2	6.0
$35-44.9	33.3	22.1	25.4
$45-54.9	33.3	25.3	27.6
$55.0-64.9	7.7	23.2	18.7
$65.0-74.9	10.3	11.6	11.2
$75.0-84.9	2.6	9.5	7.5
$85.0 +	2.6	3.2	3.0

Number of Mo. in Appointment

	HRD x (N=41)	AdEd x (N=96)	Total x (N=137)
1-6 months	0	1.0	.7
7-8 months	2.6	0	.7
9 months	64.1	54.2	57.0
10 months	15.4	7.3	9.6
11 months	0	7.3	5.2
12 months	17.9	30.2	26.7

Source of Income

	HRD x (N=41)	AdEd x (N=96)	Total x (N=137)
Institutional Base salary	75.0%	83.3%	80.8%
Other institutional inc.	7.0	7.0	7.0
Consulting	12.8	4.1	6.7
Publishing	1.4	.9	.4
Residuals & honoraria	.2	.4	.4
Grants	1.3	4.1	3.3
Other	2.3	1.3	1.6

Table 1 continued

Time spent on professorial functions

	HRD	AdEd	Total
	x	x	x
	(N=41)	(N=96)	(N=137)
Teaching activities	40.6%	33.5%	35.6%
Research and writing	15.6	17.6	17.0
Advising	11.5	15.3	14.1
Administrative duties	10.2	14.8	13.5
Committee Work	5.2	6.1	5.8
Consulting	7.7	3.0	4.4
Service-academic	3.5	3.6	3.5
Service-community	2.5	3.5	3.2
Professional Devp.	3.6	2.2	2.6

Professional Fulfillment. Sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction among the professoriate of Human Resource Development and Adult Education are presented in Tables 2 through 4. The HRD and AdEd faculty are a satisfied lot, with relatively no difference between them– 94% reported that overall they were satisfied with their career, and 86% would choose to become a professor in their field if they had it to do over again. In 1985, 87.5% of AdEd faculty reported overall satisfaction. There were no significant differences in professional fulfillment when respondents were grouped by age. While there were some differences when respondents were grouped by gender, the results were interpreted as uninteresting, indicating a degree of neutrality or satisfaction on the same side of the Likert scale.

There were significant differences in the mean responses between the two fields in only four of the 23 items measuring professional fulfillment. Except for one item, the differences were interpreted as uninteresting, indicating a degree of neutrality or satisfaction on the same side of the Likert scale. The exception, satisfaction with organizational and administrative support, identified a clearer split between the fields. Table 2 identifies the means for both groups, and the combined percentage of the respondents who were dissatisfied or very dissatisfied, or the combined percentage of the respondents who were satisfied or very satisfied.

In 1985, satisfaction (based on ranking as opposed to the Likert scale used in the present study) was derived from students, interesting work, opportunities for research and writing, and opportunities for teaching. Among the AdEd faculty, however, that study indicated a significant difference between the Canadian and American professoriate regarding research and writing which was ranked first by 38% of Canadian professors and first by 7% of American professors. In the present study, research and writing were found to be satisfying or very satisfying by 72% of HRD and 77% of AdEd faculty, but it did not rank among the top five for either field. Table 3 summarizes sources of satisfaction.

In 1985, dissatisfaction (based on ranking as opposed to the Likert scale used in the present study) was derived from research pressures, inadequate resources, administration, and poor administrative support. The current study indicates that perceptions of organizational and administrative support have not improved; in fact, it should be cause for concern that, according to the preliminary results, nearly half of the HRD faculty and one-third of the AdEd faculty find organizational and administrative support dissatisfying or very dissatisfying. Furthermore, half of the AdEd faculty and nearly one-third of HRD faculty find interactions with the administration to be dissatisfying or very dissatisfying. Table 4 summarizes sources of dissatisfaction.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE

Table 2
Professional Fulfillment

	HRD			Adult Education		
	$\bar{x}$	% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied	% satisfied or very satisfied	$\bar{x}$	% dissatisfied or very dissatisfied	% satisfied or very satisfied
1. Interactions with students	4.5		95.	4.7		98.9
2.* Interactions with other faculty (p=.029)	3.9		77.5	4.2		85.3
3. Conducting research and writing	3.9		71.8	4.1		76.8
4. The challenge of publishing	3.5	25.0	55.0	3.6	17.9	57.9
5. Teaching	4.5		100.0	4.6		97.9
6. Engaging in service to the academic community	3.8		70.0	3.6		60.0
7. Engaging in service to the broader community	4.0		70.0	3.9		66.8
8. Working in an intellectual environment	4.3		87.2	4.4		92.6
9. Working in a collegial environment	4.0		67.5	4.2		83.1
10. Working in a nurturing environment	3.7		40.0	3.8		63.2
11. Opportunity to assume a leadership role	4.1		74.4	3.9		73.7
12.* The field (p=.000)	4.6		94.6	4.0		75.0
13. Interactions with the administration	2.8	29.2	3.1	50.0		
14. Administrative responsibilities	2.6	37.5		2.7	45.6	
15.* Working conditions (p=.030)	3.0	30.0	32.5	3.5	19.4	54.8
16. Salary package	2.9	32.5	27.5	3.1	33.0	44.6
17.* Organizational and administrative support (p=.005)	2.6	47.5	20.0	3.2	30.8	45.7
18. Overall organizational climate	3.0	33.1	33.4	3.1	33.7	42.1
19. Prestige of the position	3.4		50.0	3.5		55.8
20. Prestige of the institution	3.5		52.5	3.5		54.2
21. Being a mentor	4.1		85.0	4.3		85.3
22. Having a mentor	3.0	20.5	17.9	3.3	17.9	35.8

* = Significant difference between the fields

Table 3
Top five sources of professional fulfillment, based on the percentage of faculty in HRD and Adult Education who found that item satisfying or very satisfying

HRD		Adult Ed	
Item	%	Item	%
Teaching	100	Interactions with students	99
Interactions with students	95	Teaching	98
The field	95	Working in an intellectual environment	93
Working in an intellectual environment	87	Being a mentor	85
Being a mentor	85	Interactions with faculty	85

Table 4
Top five sources of dissatisfaction, based on the percentage of faculty in HRD and Adult Education who found that item dissatisfying or very dissatisfying

HRD		Adult Ed	
Item	%	Item	%
Organizational and administrative support	48	Interactions with administration	50
Administrative responsibilities	38	Administrative responsibilities	46
Overall organizational climate	33	Overall organizational climate	34
Salary package	33	Salary package	33
Interactions with administration	30	Organizational and administrative support	31
Working conditions	30		

Interestingly, while 100% of the HRD faculty derive satisfaction from teaching, 28% indicated a preference for devoting *less* time to teaching. The mean time spent teaching was 40.6%. Ironically, 15% indicated a preference for devoting *more* time to teaching. Among the AdEd faculty, the mean time spent teaching was 33.5%. Of these faculty, 98% derive satisfaction from teaching; while 8% indicated a preference for devoting *less* time, 10% indicated a preference for devoting *more* time to this activity.

Aspects of professional fulfillment are positively correlated with several organizational and economic influences discussed in the next section. However, the only relationships of both statistical and practical significance were related to only one organizational dimension: Seeking alliances with other programs within the institution. This dimension was correlated with the overall organizational climate (r^2=.18; p=.042), working in a collegial environment (r^2=.23; p=.007), and working conditions (r^2=.17; p=.049). While the correlations are slight, ranging from .17 to .23, they are both statistically and practically significant and worthy of some analysis. It is logical that programs operating in a collegial environment, under satisfying working conditions, and within an overall satisfying organizational climate may be more likely to engage in forming collegial partnerships. On the other hand, the slight correlations could be indicative of a perceived threat that merger activity could pose to a collegial and satisfying environment.

Program Integration. In Section IV of the survey, Organizational and Economic Influences, three questions were intended to represent the propensity toward organizational alignment within one's institution. While there are a number of organizational and economic factors that help to shape the direction of the HRD and AdEd fields, these three questions reflect the feasibility of integration as a means for maintaining economic viability and responsiveness to student needs, particularly in light of economic considerations driving staffing and tenure decisions. Responses to these questions are summarized in Table 5.

A larger percentage of the AdEd faculty agreed or strongly agreed (77%) that their programs actively seek alliances than the HRD faculty (69%). While the difference is not statistically significant, it is consistent with data gathered in the open-ended question discussed

below. Slightly over half of the respondents in both fields indicated that staffing and tenure decisions were influenced by economic considerations. However, the only significant difference in the response of HRD and AdEd faculty was in the area of student enrollment. As a field, HRD appears to be attracting more new graduate students than the field of AdEd. This finding is consistent with the tendency for AdEd faculty to report a greater propensity for integration.

Table 5
Organizational and Economic Influences

	HRD		Adult Education	
	x	% agree or strongly agree	x	% agree or strongly agree
1. My program actively seeks alliances with other academic programs within the institution.	3.7	69.2	3.9	77.1
2. Economic considerations have driven recent staffing and tenure decisions in my program	3.4	59.0	3.5	56.2
3. * The number of students entering our graduate programs has increased in the past 5 years. (p=.005)	4.3	86.8	3.7	69.6

The open-ended question was intended to identify the extent to which program realignment had altered or was in the process of altering the organizational structure of HRD and AdEd, and supplemented the findings identified in Table 5. Responses indicated alignment activity; yet, the integration between AdEd and HRD was not as prevalent as expected. Although responses from the AdEd faculty tended to indicate a greater movement toward alignment with HRD than indicated by HRD faculty, they also indicated alignment with other programs, such as educational psychology and continuing studies. HRD programs indicated alignment with, in addition to AdEd, such programs as business administration, counseling, industrial technology, and instructional systems. Alignment between HRD and AdEd was primarily at the graduate level. Both faculties indicated movement away from or closure of departments titled Vocational Education.

Conclusions and Recommendations

This study was conducted to: (a) Profile the Human Resource Development and Adult Education professoriate and determine similarities and differences between them, (b) describe the nature of the job and the factors that contribute to the professional fulfillment of the faculties, and (c) identify some economic and organizational factors that contribute to the integration between the fields of Human Resource Development and Adult Education. While the results reported are preliminary, tentative conclusions can be drawn from the demographic data, and comparisons can be made between the two fields and, for the field of Adult Education, between the present study and previous studies.

One objective was to identify differences, if any, between the Adult Education (AdEd) and Human Resource Development (HRD) faculty. The two faculties appear to be quite similar, except for age, rank, and concomitant salary. There were few differences between the faculty in terms of professional fulfillment and their perceptions regarding economic and organizational influences. The similarities may be indicative of the compatibility between the two faculties, and could be interpreted as conducive to the formation of effective alliances. Indeed, there are a number of alliances being formed between AdEd and HRD faculty, and alliances with other academic programs surfaced, as well. Several economic and organizational factors appear to have shaped the formation of departmental alliances. There was a greater propensity for AdEd programs to seek academic alliances, which may be related to a perceived need to maintain economic viability.

However, further research and more thorough analyses are required before such an interpretation can be fully justified. Likewise, more thorough analyses are needed regarding the extent of integration between the fields of AdEd and HRD, and the relationships between economic and organizational perceptions and professional fulfillment. Nevertheless, we conclude that while academic alliances are not likely to be the only actions taken to address economic and organizational issues, the compatibility of the faculty, their characteristics, and the impact of these alliances on their professional fulfillment need to be considered prior to initiating these partnerships.

The data presented in this paper are based on preliminary responses to a survey for which follow-up efforts are still underway. Additional responses will be incorporated and further analyses conducted to more thoroughly respond to the research questions posed in this paper. It is intended that this study be replicated every three years in order to keep a pulse on issues that affect the HRD and AdEd professoriate, particularly since "the only way an institution can remain vital over time is for its faculty members to be provided opportunities for remaining vital over the career-span" (Kalivoda, 1994, p. 26).

In 1985, it was predicted that Adult Education programs would change very little over the next decade. For the field of AdEd, this and future studies can be compared to draw comparisons between the nature of the professoriate and identify implications that organizational and economic influences have had and will continue to have on the direction of the field.

The field of HRD is emerging and several economic and organizational factors have the potential for guiding its direction. The focus of a field is informed by its faculty and their experiences. Insight into the characteristics and professional fulfillment of faculty will have an impact on future alliances, whether of an academic or broader nature. In describing the growing complexities of the modern research university, it has been suggested that "faculty members of the 21st century could well be asked to set aside their roles as teachers to become designers of learning experiences, processes, and environments" (Duderstadt, 1995, p. 5). The data gathered in this study provides a foundation for future comparative studies regarding the dynamics needed to address the inevitability of forging new relationships and alliances.

References

Baldridge, V., Curtis, D., Ecker, G. & Riley, G. (1978). Policy-making and effective leadership: A national study of academic management. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

Baldwin, R. (1990). Faculty vitality beyond the reseach university: Extending a contextual contecept. The Journal of Higher Education, 61 (2), 160-181.

Duderstadt, J. (1995). Academic renewal at Michigan. Executive Strategies, 1, 1-18. National Association of College and University Business Officers and the Stanford Forum for Higher Education.

Eckert, R. & Williams, H. (1972). College faculty view themselves and their jobs. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Elmore, R. (1995). Structural reform and educational practice. Educational Researcher, 24 (9), 23-26.

Firestone, W. & Pennell, J. (1993). Teacher commitment, working conditions, and differential incentive policies. Review of Educational research, 63 (4), 489-525.

Harrison, C. (1995). A survey of graduate adult education programs and the adult learning and development curriculum. Adult Education Quarterly, 45 (4), 197-212.

Johnstone, D. (1994). College at work. Journal of Higher Education, 65 (2), 168-182.

Kalivoda, P. (1994). Factors that influence faculty vitality: Synthesis of a new framework. Unpublished Paper. Office of Instructional Development, The University of Georgia.

Ladd, E. & Lipset, S. (1976). The Ladd-Lipset Survey Series. The Chronicle of Higher Education, 11 (1) (3) (4) (5), 12 (1) (10) (13).

Stecklein, J. & Eckert, R. (1958). An exploratory study of factors influencing the choice of college teaching as a career. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota Press.

Sundre, D. (1992). The specification of the content domain of faculty scholarship. Research in Higher Education, 33 (3), 297-316.

Willie, R., Copeland, H., & Williams, H. (1985). The adult education professoriat of the United States and Canada. International Journal of Lifelong Education, 4 (1), 55-67.

Willie, R. & Stecklein, J. (1982). A three-decade comparison of college faculty characteristics, satisfactions, activities, and attitudes. Research in Higher Education, 16 (1), 81-93.

BEST COPY AVAILABLE